8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

josh@westcoastlitigation.com **Hyde & Swigart**

4129 Main Street, Suite B8

andrea@westcoastlitigation.com

Andrea Darrow Smith, Esq. (SBN: 265237)

Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557)

Riverside, CA 92501

(951) 784-7770 (619) 297-1022

Attorneys for Melinda Ancrum

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No: <u>'12CV0880 W</u> MDD Melinda Ancrum Plaintiff, **Complaint For Damages** v. **Jury Trial Demanded** Legal Recovery Law Offices, Inc.; Capital One Bank (USA) N.A. Defendants.

Introduction

The United States Congress has found abundant evidence of the use of 1. abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors, and has determined that abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy. Congress wrote the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. (hereinafter "FDCPA"), to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt

HYDE & SWIGART

Riverside, California

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

- 1 of 9 -Complaint

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses.
- 2. The California legislature has determined that the banking and credit system and grantors of credit to consumers are dependent upon the collection of just and owing debts and that unfair or deceptive collection practices undermine the public confidence that is essential to the continued functioning of the banking and credit system and sound extensions of credit to consumers. The Legislature has further determined that there is a need to ensure that debt collectors exercise this responsibility with fairness, honesty and due regard for the debtor's rights and that debt collectors must be prohibited from engaging in unfair or deceptive acts or practices.
- Melinda Ancrum, ("Plaintiff"), through Plaintiff's attorneys, brings this action 3. to challenge the actions of Legal Recovery Law Offices, Inc. ("LRLO"); Capital One Bank (USA) N.A. ("Capital One"), (collectively "Defendants"), with regard to attempts by Defendants to unlawfully and abusively collect a debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff, and this conduct caused Plaintiff damages.
- Plaintiff makes these allegations on information and belief, with the exception 4. of those allegations that pertain to a plaintiff, or to a plaintiff's counsel, which Plaintiff alleges on personal knowledge.
- While many violations are described below with specificity, this Complaint 5. alleges violations of the statutes cited in their entirety.
- 6. Unless otherwise stated, all the conduct engaged in by Defendants took place in California.
- Any violations by Defendants were knowing, willful, and intentional, and 7. Defendants did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such violation.
- 8. Any and all violations alleged against LRLO are imputed to Capital One under the theory of vicarious liability, because the actions undertaken by

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Defendant LRLO were an attempt to collect the alleged debt by an attorney's office on behalf of Defendant Capital One.
- 9. All violations alleged under the FDCPA are alleged as to Defendant LRLO.
- 10. All violations alleged under the Rosenthal Act are alleged as to all named Defendants.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 11. Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(k), and 28 U.S.C. § 1367 for supplemental state claims.
- 12. This action arises out of Defendants' violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA") and the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, California Civil Code §§ 1788-1788.32 ("Rosenthal Act").
- 13. Because Defendants do business within the State of California, personal jurisdiction is established.
- 14. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.
- 15. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c).
- 16. Defendant commonly conduct business in San Diego County and are subject to personal jurisdiction in San Diego County, therefore Defendant resides in tis judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c).
- 20 17. At all times relevant, Defendants conducted business within the State of California.
- PARTIES 22
- 23 18. Plaintiff is a natural person who resides in the State of California.
- 24 19. Defendant LRLO is located in the in the State of California.
- 25 20. Defendant Capital One is located in the State of Virginia.
- 21. Plaintiff is obligated or allegedly obligated to pay a debt, and is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 22. Defendants are persons who use an instrumentality of interstate commerce or the mails in a business the principal purpose of which is the collection of debts, or who regularly collect or attempt to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another and are therefore debt collectors as that phrase is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
- Plaintiff is a natural person from whom a debt collector sought to collect a 23. consumer debt which was due and owing or alleged to be due and owing from Plaintiff, and is a "debtor" as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(h).
- 24. Defendants, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of themselves, or others, engage in debt collection as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(b), are therefore debt collectors as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(c).
- 25. This case involves money, property or their equivalent, due or owing or alleged to be due or owing from a natural person by reason of a consumer credit transaction. As such, this action arises out of a consumer debt and "consumer credit" as those terms are defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- Sometime before March 2011, Plaintiff is alleged to have incurred certain 26. financial obligations.
- 27. These financial obligations were primarily for personal, family or household purposes and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(5).
- 28. These alleged obligations were money, property, or their equivalent, which is due or owing, or alleged to be due or owing, from a natural person to another person and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(d), and a "consumer debt" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(f).

- 29. Sometime thereafter, but before March 2011, Plaintiff allegedly fell behind in the payments allegedly owed on the alleged debt. Plaintiff currently takes no position as to the validity of this alleged debt.
- 30. Subsequently, but before March 2011, the alleged debt was assigned, placed, or otherwise transferred, to Defendants for collection.
- 31. On or about early March 2011, Defendant LRLO, acting on behalf of its client Capital One, telephoned Plaintiff at her place of employment.
- 32. This communication to Plaintiff was a "communication" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2), and an "initial communication" consistent with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a).
- 33. This communication was a "debt collection" as Cal. Civ. Code 1788.2(b) defines that phrase, and an "initial communication" consistent with Cal. Civ. Code § 1812.700(b).
- 34. Defendant LRLO telephoned Plaintiff at her place of employment several times during the month of March 2011.
- 35. When Defendant LRLO telephoned Plaintiff's work, Plaintiff's receptionist answered the call.
- 18 36. Each time Plaintiff's receptionist answered LRLO's calls she picked up the phone and stated: "This is the Crisis Walking Center, how may I help you?"
 - 37. Plaintiff's receptionist informed Defendant LRLO during each call that Plaintiff was unavailable and that this was her work number and that LRLO should call Plaintiff on her personal number instead of at work.
 - 38. During April 2011 Defendant LRLO continued to place calls to Plaintiff's work despite being advised by the receptionist to call Plaintiff on her personal number.
 - 39. Throughout the month of April 2011, LRLO placed multiple calls to Plaintiff's work and disclosed to both Plaintiff's receptionist and another

- coworker that LRLO was calling for Plaintiff because she owed money to Capital One.
- 40. Except as provided in 15 U.S.C. § 1692b, and without the prior consent of the consumer given directly to the Defendant, and without the express permission of a court of competent jurisdiction, and for a purpose not reasonably necessary to effectuate a postjudgment judicial remedy, Defendant communicated, in connection with the collection of a debt, with a person other than the consumer, his attorney, a consumer reporting agency, the creditor, the attorney of the creditor, or the attorney of Defendant. Consequently, Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b).
- 41. Because this violated certain portions of the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act as these portions are incorporated by reference in the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, through California Civil Code § 1788.17, this conduct or omission violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.
- 42. Through this conduct, Defendant communicated with the employer of Plaintiff regarding the alleged debt when such a communication was not necessary to the collection of the alleged debt, and when the attorney for Plaintiff had not consented in writing to such communication. Consequently, this conduct or omission violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.12(a).
- 43. When Plaintiff's receptionist and coworker relayed this information to Plaintiff they questioned Plaintiff about her alleged debt.
- 44. During April 2011, Plaintiff's receptionist was so frustrated with LRLO's continued calls that she spoke to Plaintiff's supervisor regarding the frequent collection calls.
- 45. During one call in late April 2011, Plaintiff's supervisor spoke to LRLO during a collection call.
- 46. Plaintiff's supervisor informed LRLO that these continued calls to the workplace needed to stop.

1

- 34
- 56
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- 12 13
- 15

14

1718

16

- 1920
- 21
- 22
- 2324

25

2627

28

- 47. Only after speaking with Plaintiff's supervisor, LRLO ceased calls to Plaintiff's workplace.
- 48. Due to Defendants' actions, Plaintiff suffered actual damages in the form of mental anguish which manifested in symptoms including but not limited to: nervousness, stress, anxiety, loss of sleep, feelings of irritability, embarrassment, frustration, all impacting Plaintiff's personal relationships.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

AS TO DEFENDANT LRLO

FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (FDCPA) 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 ET SEQ.

- 49. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 50. The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq.
- 51. As a result of each and every violation of the FDCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to any actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1); statutory damages in an amount up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A); and, reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) from each and every defendant, jointly and severally.

COUNT II

AS TO ALL NAMED DEFENDANTS

ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (ROSENTHAL ACT)

CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1788-1788.32

- 52. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- Complaint 7 of 9 -

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 53. The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Rosenthal Act, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of the Rosenthal Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788-1788.32
- As a result of each and every violation of the Rosenthal Act, Plaintiff is 54. entitled to any actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a); statutory damages for a knowing or willful violation in the amount up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c) from each and every defendant, jointly and severally.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant LRLO, and Plaintiff be awarded damages from Defendant, as follows:

- An award of actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3);
- An award of actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);
- An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);
- An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c).
- WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant Capital One and Plaintiff be awarded damages from Defendant, as follows:
 - An award of actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);

- 8 of 9 -

An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);

Complaint

An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c).

TRIAL BY JURY

55. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiffs are entitled to, and demand, a trial by jury.

Respectfully submitted,

Hyde & Swigart

Date: April 9, 2012 By:s/ Andrea Darrow Smith

Email: andrea@westcoastlitigation.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Complaint - 9 of 9 -

$\underset{\text{$\sim$JS 44 (Rev. 12/07)}}{\text{Case 3:12-cv-00880-W-MDD}} \underset{\text{\simDCIVIL COVER SHEET}}{\text{\simDocument 1. Filed 04/10/12}} \quad \text{Page ID.10} \quad \text{Page 10 of 10}$

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Melinda Ancrum			DEFENDANTS Legal Recovery Law Offices, Inc.; Capital One Bank (USA) N.A.		
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE					
				NVOLVED.	
				'12CV08	880 W MDD
	e, Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)		
lyde & Swigart 4129 M 951) 784-7770	ain Street, Suite B8 Riverside, CA		_		
II. BASIS OF JURISE	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. C		RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government	■ 3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citiz		1	incipal Place
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item I		en of Another State	2	
	(mulcate Citizenship of Farties in fem i	Citiz	ten or Subject of a preign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	•	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	D A NIZDI IDTZIV	OTHER STATUTES
CONTRACT ☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL II		10 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES ☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal In	njury - 🗖 62	20 Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 410 Antitrust
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malp Liability ☐ 365 Personal In		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment			30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck	PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 820 Copyrights	□ 460 Deportation□ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Proc	duct 🗖 65	50 Airline Regs.	☐ 830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability Liability 340 Marine PERSONAL PRO		60 Occupational Safety/Health	☐ 840 Trademark	□ 480 Consumer Credit□ 490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Frau	d □ 69	90 Other	COCIAL CECUPITY	☐ 810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability ☐ 371 Truth in Le ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Person		LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	□ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Department of the		Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	□ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Lia		30 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	■ 890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PET	TITIONS 174	& Disclosure Act 40 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	□ 891 Agricultural Acts□ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to ☐ 442 Employment Sentence		90 Other Labor Litigation	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	893 Environmental Matters
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpu		91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	□ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Pena	alty	IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7609	Act ☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus	& Other	62 Naturalization Application	1	Under Equal Access
	Employment		63 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee		to Justice 950 Constitutionality of
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights	□ 46	65 Other Immigration Actions		State Statutes
	Li 440 Other Civil Rights		Actions		
又 1 Original □ 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from		istated of 5 another	ferred from	
Proceeding St	Appellate Court Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq.		pened (special (special (pened (special (Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cause: Unfair Debt Collection Practi				
VII. REQUESTED IN		TION D 75,001.	DEMAND \$		if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	7 0,001.	.00 ·	JURY DEMAND:	Yes N o
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE (OF ATTORNEY	OF RECORD		
4/10/2012	s/Andrea D	arrow Smi	th		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT APPLYING	IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE